

Significant Disproportionality Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services Calculation Summary

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with § 613(f) of the IDEA U.S.C. § 1413(f) and the regulations in 34 CFR § 300.223, comprehensive coordinated early intervening services are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education and related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. Local education agencies (LEAs) identified as having significant disproportionality, as defined by the state, are required to set aside 15% of their new allocation for the development and provision of comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CCEIS) for students not currently identified as needing special education services. LEAs may also voluntarily set aside funds (up to 15%) for the development and provision of CCEIS.

The rationale for using IDEA funds for CCEIS is based on research showing that the earlier a child's learning problems or difficulties are identified, the more quickly and effectively the problems and difficulties can be addressed and the greater the chances that the child's problems will be ameliorated or decreased in severity. Conversely, the longer a child goes without assistance, the longer the remediation time and the more intense and costly services might be.

This 2018-2019 CCEIS identification is based on the federally required seven racial/ethnic groups in the areas of identification, disability category, educational environment category, and five disciplinary action categories as seen below.

Racial/Ethnic Groups	Disability Categories	Discipline
1. American Indian/Alaskan Native 2. Asian 3. Black/African American 4. Hispanic or Latino 5. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 6. White 7. Two or more race groups	1. Autism 2. Emotional Disturbance 3. Intellectual Disability 4. Other Health Impairment 5. Speech/Language Impairment 6. Specific Learning Disabilities	1. Out-of-School Suspension ≤ 10 Days 2. Out-of-School Suspension > 10 Days 3. In-School Suspensions ≤ 10 Days 4. In-School Suspensions > 10 Days 5. Total Removals
Educational Environments Categories		
1. Students in the regular classroom less than 40% of the school day 2. Students receiving special education services in a day school setting		

II. METHODOLOGY USED TO EXAMINE SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY

To generate the CCEIS profiles relevant student data is used for the risk ratio/alternate risk ratio analysis.

The selection criteria for Identification: All Disabilities.

1. The December 1 child count by race for the selected year(s) is the IDEA data set and is adjusted for students whose educational environment is parentally placed in a private school, correctional facility, or a private residential treatment program. These students are removed from the child count data set.
2. The October 1 enrollment counts by race for the selected year(s) is the comparison data set.
(Note: there is no adjustment to the dataset.)
3. After the December 1 child count has been adjusted, both sets of data are loaded into the Excel template to generate the risk ratios. The risk ratios are generated using a cell size of 5, an N size of 15, and a risk ratio threshold of 3.
4. Any district exceeding a risk ratio of 3 for the same specific race for three consecutive years will flag.

The selection criteria for Identification: Specific Disabilities.

1. The December 1 child count by race and specific disability for the selected year(s) is the IDEA data set and is adjusted for students whose educational environment is parentally placed in a private school, correctional facility, or a private residential treatment program. These students are removed from the child count data set.
2. The October 1 enrollment counts by race for the selected year(s) is the comparison data set.
(Note: there is no adjustment to the dataset).
3. After the December 1 child count has been adjusted, both sets of data are loaded into the Excel template to generate the risk ratios. The risk ratios are generated using a cell size of 5, an N size of 15, and a risk ratio threshold of 3.
4. Any district exceeding a risk ratio of 3 for the same specific race and disability for three consecutive years will flag.

The selection criteria for Educational Environment:

1. The December 1 child count by race and specific educational environment (there are two categories) for the selected year(s) is the IDEA data set.
2. The December 1 child count by race for the selected year(s) is adjusted for students whose educational environment is parentally placed in a private school, correctional facility, or a private residential treatment program. These students are removed from the child count data set and the remaining records are the comparison data set.
3. After the adjustments, risk ratios are generated using a cell size of 5, an N size of 15, and a risk

ratio threshold of 3.

4. Any district exceeding a risk ratio of 3 for the same specific race and educational environment for three consecutive years will flag.

The selection criteria for Discipline:

1. The discipline data by race and specific action taken (there are 5 categories) for the selected year(s) is the IDEA data set.
2. The December 1 child count by race for the selected year(s) is adjusted for students whose educational environment is parentally placed in a private school, correctional facility, or a private residential treatment program. These students are removed from the child count data set and the remaining records are the comparison data set.
3. After the adjustments, risk ratios are generated using a cell size of 5, an N size of 15, and a risk ratio threshold of 3.
4. Any district exceeding a risk ratio of 3 for the same specific race and discipline category for three consecutive years will flag.

III. SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY AND COMPREHENSIVE COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES

Any LEA with a risk ratio **greater than 3 for three consecutive years within the same race and analysis category** is designated as an LEA having significant disproportionality. Local education agencies (LEA) identified as having a significantly disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups within one or more of the mentioned areas in Section I are required to:

1. Conduct a root cause analysis.
2. Complete the Success Gap Rubric with follow up monitoring activities conducted as applicable.
3. Complete the disproportionality self-assessment including the individual student worksheets with follow up monitoring activities conducted as applicable.
4. Submit the Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) application to ADE Special Education Finance.
5. Budget 15% of the next year's Part B allocation for the provision of Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) to general education students who are at risk of being identified as needing special education and related services, and students with disabilities ages 3-21. Students being provided services under CCEIS **MUST** be comprised of more than 50% non-disabled students.
6. Track students served in the Early Intervening module in eSchool and report them in Cycle 7.

III. QUESTIONS

Additional information regarding calculations may be obtained by contacting the Director of the IDEA Data & Research Office at University of Arkansas-Little Rock, Jody Fields, Ph.D. (jafields@ualr.edu). Questions about allowable expenses, CCEIS application, and budgetary requirements should be sent to the ADE Special Education Finance section.

IV. GLOSSARY

A. What is Risk?

As a concept, “risk” looks at the general enrollment data for each racial group along with the number of students from that group who were identified for a specified category and calculates the likelihood that a student from that racial group would be found in that particular category. Risk is a concept that can be used for any given category, not just special education. One can calculate the risk for being suspended, the risk for being identified as gifted, or the risk for being identified as having a disability of a certain type. In other words, if we randomly picked any student from a given racial group enrolled in a district, risk tells us the likelihood that the student would belong in the category in question. For example, if the risk for Black/African American students being identified as having an Emotional Disturbance is 3%, that means that if we picked a Black/African American student at random from a district, the odds are 3 out of 100 that the chosen student would have been identified as having an Emotional Disturbance. Mathematically, to calculate risk, we can determine the percentage of students of a particular racial group that have a particular disability. To do that we divide the smaller number (number of students of the racial group in the disability category) by the larger number (number of general education students of the racial group enrolled in the district) and multiply that result by 100.

B. Risk Ratio

The calculation of a risk ratio where one racial group is compared to all others requires multiples steps. The concept, however, is the same as comparing a given racial group to Whites. The first step is the same in that we must first calculate the risk for each racial group. Next we would need to recalculate the risk for all other students in the district minus the students in the focus racial group. For example, if the Emotional Disturbance risk for Black/African American students is 10.8%, one would compare the Black/African American risk to the risk for all other students in the district who are not Black/African American. If the focus racial group is White, one would compare the White risk to the risk for all other students in the district who are not White. So the risk for the ALL OTHER groups changes for each risk ratio depending on the focus racial group.

C. Alternate Risk Ratio

The calculation of an alternate risk ratio where one racial group is compared to all others requires multiple steps. The concept, however, is the same as risk ratio, except when the comparison racial groups fail to meet the minimum N

size to conduct the analysis. When this occurs, the state data is substituted for the LEA comparison data creating an alternate risk ratio.

D. Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS)

Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) is the program name in the Significant Disproportionality revised regulation for when an LEA is identified as having significant disproportionality and **MUST** set aside 15% of funds for the provision of CCEIS. LEAs required to provide CCEIS can serve children ages 3-21, both non-disabled and disabled (non-disabled must be majority served), and must track both groups of students in the early intervening module in eSchool.

E. Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) is the program name in the Significant Disproportionality revised regulations for when an LEA **voluntarily** sets aside funds (up to 15%) for the CEIS. LEAs who voluntarily offer the program are allowed to only serve non-disabled students in grades K-12 and must track students in the early intervening module in eSchool.